

## Interim Council of the Faculty of Fine Arts

Minutes - June 13, 1975

### PRESENT:

Dean A. Pinsky (Chairman); Professors D. Andrus, P. Cohen, E.F. Cooke, G. Gross, A. Herman, D. Jones, C. Gabriel-Lacki, P. Landsley, J. Miller, S. Paikowsky, W. Reznicek, L. Sherman, J. Smoke, P. Spensley, F. Mulvey, K. Sloan, N. Springford, J. Turner, B. Wainwright

Fac. of Arts Rep: Professor W. Francis

Grad. Student Rep: Ian Howard

- \* 1. The Interim Council was called to order at 9:30 a.m. It was moved by Prof. E.F. Cooke and seconded by Prof. J. Smoke that the minutes of the meeting of May 9, 1975 be approved.

Motion CARRIED

### 2. Chairman's Remarks

Professor Pinsky noted that effective as of June 1, 1975 the Faculty of Fine Arts became official. He explained that during the next six months Professor Bordan would be on leave and that Professors J. Whitelaw and J. McBride would take over the responsibilities of the Vice-Rector's office. Regarding appointments and approval of the model, as well as financing for the Faculty it would be some time during late summer before decisions could be received from the Vice-Rector's office.

He noted that Faculty Council could now elect its representatives to Senate, to the Board of Graduate Studies and the Faculty Tenure Committee.

Regarding the integration of activities on both campuses it had been agreed by Acting Vice-Rector Whitelaw that we would use the Sir George model until such time as the Concordia University regulations were in place. He expressed the hope that right from the beginning the Faculty could assume total merger in all aspects of its work. For example he thought it advisable to start thinking of total mobility between the two campuses with regard to transportation, facilities and course availability. He noted also that inevitably there would be many problems administratively that would affect programmes and faculty.

With respect to the Cinema proposal Dean Pinsky announced that at the last meeting of Senate the Cinema major had been tabled. He noted that every effort would be made to have the proposal put forward to Senate again in early September.

With respect to salary negotiations, Dean Pinsky expressed the hope that within the next couple of weeks a final settlement would be reached.

#### Questions from the Floor

There were several questions put forward with respect to operating within the next structure for the Faculty of Fine Arts, regarding budget, creation of appropriate committees and with regard to mobility between the two campuses.

Dean Pinsky explained that most of these problems would have to wait until early Fall before they could be ironed out, however, during the interim, he would establish appropriate committees to deal with certain aspects of the new model.

#### Elections

##### Board of Graduate Studies:

Those members elected were: Professor J. Smoke (as Director, Graduate Programmes), Professor Jerome Krause and Professor Sandra Paikowsky.

##### Senate:

Those members elected were: Professor Gerry Gross and Professor J. Locke.

### Faculty Tenure Committee

The composition required for the Faculty Tenure Committee was explained as follows;

The Dean

Two tenured members of Faculty (elected by the full-time members of that Faculty)

One tenured member of any Faculty appointed by CUAFA (Professor D. Andrus, C. Gabriel-Lacki, alternate)

One tenured member of any Faculty appointed by the Vice-Rector, Academic

Nominations were: Professors Barry Wainwright, Philip Spensley, Leah Sherman and Phil Cohen

Those members elected to serve were Professors Barry Wainwright and Philip Spensley.

- \* It was moved by Professor G. Gross and seconded by Prof. N. Springford that Professors L. Sherman and P. Cohen would serve as alternates.

### Faculty Curriculum Committee

- \* It was moved by Professor Spensley and second by Prof. Sherman to accept the Faculty Curriculum Committee with its present composition as follows;

Prof. J. Smoke, Chairman, Professors Gary Walters, Reesa Greenberg, Phil Cohen, John Locke, Mervin Dewes, Gerry Gross and Mrs. Anne Adams

Prof. Smoke noted that since Fine Arts was following the Arts Faculty model, members of the Curriculum Planning Committee were elected for a three-year term so that a continuity could be kept and to prevent constant rotations on that Committee.

### Theatre Arts Proposal

Professor Gerry Gross presented Council with an interim Theatre Arts proposal which merged the two programs of Theatre Arts and Drama and recommended to Council that the Priorities Committee study the problems associated with its implementation. He expressed the hope that recommendations could be made and put into effect for September 1975.



Professor Pinsky explained that a new programme in Theatre Arts would be put forward to Council in September before it went forward to Senate for approval. However, this interim proposal may pose some problems connected with the introduction and utilization of courses on the two campuses for next September.

Professor Francis wanted to know why the interim proposal needed to go to the Priorities Committee if there were no curriculum changes and no additional resources required.

Professor Gross noted that since the Priorities Committee had already dealt with the proposal it should continue with the final recommendations.

Professor Francis explained that a precedent would be set by having a Priorities Committee dealing directly with departments rather than coming back to Council and that it might be better to choose a different method.

Professor Sherman wanted to know the composition of the Priorities Committee.

Professor Pinsky explained that he had established an ad hoc Priorities Committee in order to deal with the problems confronting him. It was his intention that Council elect this Committee in September.

Professor Sherman explained that if the problem of Theatre Arts was the timetabling and scheduling for next September, that it was not the business of Council to do administrative work.

Professor Gross said the proposed interim program was close enough to the spirit of the new programme that it would allow students the benefit of the new programme. He felt that when certain choices were made in timetabling one could influence a programme and if students were influenced in a certain way they could be given a better programme.

Professor Sherman felt that the business of Council should be to consider a proposal in terms of its content, its purpose, what it was going to do for the student, what potential students there were for such a programme and, in addition, all its academic, professional, theoretical and practical content. She noted that Council did not decide on budget nor implementation of programmes.

Professor Spensley noted then that perhaps the Priorities Committee did not have to deal with the proposal and that it was really a Departmental matter.

Professor Gross noted that a report from Priorities Committee did come before Council in this University. It would be the job of Priorities to answer these questions, however, Council would also be provided with full data and would be permitted to ask pertinent questions.

Professor Pinsky explained that the Priorities Committee had approved the merging of the two existing programmes. The difficulty was that with the merged situation many new courses were available to students on the Sir George and Loyola campuses. New choices could be made and obviously certain kinds of timetabling problems arise that need to be resolved. He felt that these problems could be resolved at the departmental level.

#### Steering Committee

Questions arose regarding the formation and composition of a Steering Committee. Dean Pinsky noted that the function of a Steering Committee would be to advise him on the business of Council, on the preparation of Council agenda etc. and that in September Council could elect such a Committee. In the meantime, decisions he would have to make would be temporary ones.

Professor Andrus wanted to know when the final composition of Faculty Council would be established.

Professor Pinsky explained that Council had until January 1977 to decide on its final composition. He noted that it would be advisable to have a Council of the whole during the next academic year so that everyone could become involved who wished to.

Professor Sherman agreed and noted that it was an important educational process for everyone.

Professor Spensley asked whether it would not be appropriate to elect representatives to sit on other Faculty Councils.

Professor Pinsky explained that Council would have to make representation to Senate to have voting membership on other Faculty Councils.

\*It was moved by Professor Sherman and seconded by Professor Spensley that this Council approach Senate to approve Fine Arts representation on the Arts Faculty Council at Sir George Williams Campus and Arts & Science Faculty Council at Loyola.

Motion CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.